

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 5, and 6 being independent.

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended in an effort to clarify the claims to Applicant's original intent, and therefore, these amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative would like to thank the Examiner, Paul Bell, for the personal interview that was conducted on July 21, 2004. During the interview, independent claims 1, 5, and 6 were discussed. Applicant's representative also proposed a minor amendment in an effort to clarify claims 1 and 5, whereby the Examiner acknowledged that this After Final Amendment would be entered.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hirgurashi et al.* (US 6,222,593) in view of *Van Court* (US 5,917,552). This rejection is respectfully traversed insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims.

As previously submitted, *Hirgurashi et al.* is directed to an image projecting system for synthesizing onto a screen images that are projected from a plurality of projectors to obtain a very fine image; and *Van Court* is directed to a video signal interface system utilizing a deductive control scheme. The video signal interface system of *Van Court* displays video signals from various sources and includes a processor that is responsive to an input video signal for measuring characteristics of the video signal. These "measured characteristics include the type of video signal (i.e., whether the signal is a broadcast video signal or a computer video signal) and the protocol of the video source (i.e., number of wires on which the input video signal is carried)," see col. 1, lines 54-57.

As explicitly noted during the interview, neither *Hirgurashi et al.* nor *Van Court* teach or suggest a multi-display projector system, whereby each of the projectors include at least the features as recited in the claims. More specifically, the cited art fails to teach or suggest, as previously submitted, input format parameters of an input image signal that specify: (a) a number of active pixels, (b) a number of active lines, (c) an initial active pixel, and (d) an active initial line, as recited in the claims.

Furthermore, the cited art also fails to teach or suggest that an active image signal is extracted from an input image signals on the basis of the input format parameters, and that this extracted active image signal is then utilized to display a region of the

image on the basis of display parameters, as recited in the independent claims.

Applicants again note that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion of motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations, see *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 48, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Because the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be substantiated. Dependent claims 2-4 should be considered allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully


requested to contact Martin Geissler (Reg. 51,011) at telephone number (703) 205-8000, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Michael K. Mutter, Reg.#29,680

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MKM/MRG:tm